

21

# A SERMON

Preached before the

# KING

At *WHITE-HALL*,

*June the 25th. 1682.*

---

By *SAMUEL FULLER, D.D.*  
Chancelour of the Church of *Lincoln*, and  
Chaplain in ordinary to His Majesty.

---

Published by His Majesty's Special Command.

---

*L O N D O N,*

Printed by *M. Flether*, for *Jacob Tonson*, at the  
*Judge's Head in Chancery-lane. 1682.*

THE  
CROWN  
OF  
THORNS

BY  
JOHN  
LEWIS

ILLUSTRATED  
BY  
JOHN  
LEWIS

THE  
CROWN  
OF  
THORNS

ILLUSTRATED  
BY  
JOHN  
LEWIS

THE  
CROWN  
OF  
THORNS

ILLUSTRATED  
BY  
JOHN  
LEWIS

THE  
CROWN  
OF  
THORNS

ILLUSTRATED  
BY  
JOHN  
LEWIS

# THE SERMON KING.

Preached before the

KING.

Matth. xxii. 21, 22. No food given.

*They say unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar, the things that are Cesar's, and unto God, the things that are God's. When they heard these words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.*

THE Pharisees being incensed by the Parable our Saviour used in the beginning of this Chapter, consult together for opportunities of advantage and revenge; and knowing him to be a free Speaker, who would not conceal his thoughts for fear of Men, they endeavour to surprize his Sincerity.

*A Sermon preached before the King.*

rity with an ensnaring Question concerning Cesar's Tribute : and to doe this more effectually, they sent some of their own Disciples with the *Herodians*, the Followers of Herod, as the *Syriack* reads it, such as adhered to his Authority as *Roman* Governour, to make their Question more insidious, and his Answer more difficult : for by this artifice he was in danger'd by whatsoever he said, either to fall under the displeasure of one of the Parties or to give advantage to both ; for if he asserted Tribute was to be paid, he was sure to provoke the *Pharisees*, the most eminent Sect of the *Jewish Religion*, who believed the *Roman* Government an Usurpation, and if he denied it, which in all likelihood they more especially hoped and desired, they were both ready to lay aside their mutual differences, and to accuse him jointly to the *Roman* Governours, for we find that the *Pharisees* could pretend loyalty to *Cesar*, when it was of use to serve their malice against our Saviour, and therefore this was afterwards their plea with *Pilate*, *I know art no friend to Cesar, if thou let this man go*. This instructed, the Messengers of their malice went to our Saviour, and supposing him subject to their own and the frailties of those

those that sent them, they address with fawning and flattery, bespeak him in an humble title with reverence and respect, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth; thou affectest not the favour of Cesar nor Herod, nor Pontius Pilate, nor any of their Deputies; nor canst be deterred by any Authority whatsoever from declaring what thou knowest to be our duty: *Is it lawfull to give tribute to Cesar, or no?*

But our Saviour's Knowledge was not to be imposed on by fair words, nor his Integrity to be corrupted by flattery, he perceives their wickedness and therefore first as an instance of his sincerity lets them know he understood the malice and design of their question; and in a very familiar rebuke declares the opinion he had of them and their enquiry, *why tempt you me ye Hypocrites?*

But secondly, left by his plainness he might expose himself too much; he gives an instance of his Prudence by so tempering the matter of his Answer, that neither side could find that occasion of offence and quarrel they sought by this Question, but both leave him silent and astonished at the wisdom of his Reply: *When they heard these words, they marvelled, and left him and went their way.*

They

*A Sermon preached before the King.*

They that owned and asserted the *Roman* Government had no pretence of being dissatisfied with that Answer which was so punctual in favour of the Rights of the Emperor, nor could they who believed it an usurpation be reasonably offended because he gives his resolution with so much respect to their own practice and concessions :

“ The Coyn you own and use, the Image  
“ and Signature you confess to be *Cesar's*, by  
“ both you acknowledge his Supremacy, and  
“ therefore ought not to dispute what is his  
“ due as Supreme ; for since Coyning is the  
“ undoubted prerogative of the chief Magi-  
“ strate, since this is your currant Money, has  
“ its impression, name, and value from *Ce-*  
“ *sar*, you have by this owned his investiture  
“ in the Government, by this he appears to  
“ be the publick Protector of your civil Com-  
“ merce, and therefore ought to have a por-  
“ tion of that Coyn for his tribute as the just  
“ price of your wealth and common safety ;  
“ this is the beloved Image of *Cesar* that serves  
“ your Trade and Trafick, and gives you  
“ trust and authority amongst your fellow  
“ Subjects, and why should it not be an in-  
“ strument of Justice to your Prince as well as  
“ gain to you ? Peruse the Inscription, inquire  
“ into

## A Sermon preached before the King.

58

Unto the Date and Story, and you will find  
Unt an ancient record of the *Roman Conquest*,  
Unt your Submission, and it cannot be rea-  
Untsonable to question that Authority now,  
Unt which you have so long owned and sub-  
Unt mitted to. These are the natural enlarge-  
Unt ments of the several Topicks comprehended  
Unt in our Saviour's short Argument, ~~addore by me~~  
Unt Kaiou, Kaiou, render therefore unto Cesar, the  
Unt things that are Cesar's, for your own Conces-  
Unt sions have determined the case.

35 But he leaves them not thus, but adds,  
*all the rest of the day, and to God the things that are*  
God's. If He is not content only to satisfy the  
curiosity of the Inquirers as to Cesar's dues,  
but out of his abundant goodness he enlarges  
his advice to other obligations, and reflects  
upon their neglect and contempt of greater  
duties, one of his chief ends of his coming  
was to instruct and doe good, which that he  
might accomplish with the best advantage,  
he takes and improves every opportunity;  
when a particular occasion is offered, of deli-  
vering some lesser truth, he adds the advice  
of a greater; where enquiry is made of some  
special duty, he delivers his answer in such ge-  
neral rules which may serve in larger and  
more difficult circumstances than the En-  
quirer

Grot. in  
loc.

chirer proposed as he lived not for himself alone, but for us also, so he is not content by a prudent answer to have consulted his own temporal safety, till also upon that particular occasion he had declared something that might conduce to the eternal salvation of those that heard him, even of those that by this enquiry endeavoured to destroy him.   
 sapientiā fīmo responſo. & modis ſeditionis. & violē  
 late religiosis ratōnūm in inſidioſifma graueſiōne effugit. Also our honourable oys I moſt  
 He knew how necessary honour and eſteem were to make a Prophet ſuccesfull; and therefore he keeps himſelf within the ſtrict meaſures of prudence, that he might neither provoke the Government, nor diſturb the People: had he conſented to their temptation to Sedition, and uttered mutinous words againſt Cesar, he might ſoon have been reſtrained from his liberty of inſtructing, or at beſt, if he had eſcapèd the censure of the Magistrate, he muſt neceſſarily have brought ſuſpicion and reproach upon his Office and Doctrine, for Men are generally diſpoſed to diſtruct the Diſcourses of a ſeditionous Teacher; and to ſuſpect the moſt evident Truth delivered with angeſ and deſign, and therefore our Saviour uſes all the Arts of a watchfull

watchfull Instructor, creates no prejudices by heats and indiscretions, but teaches with that calm and unaffected plainness, that his Doctrines, besides the authority of their native evidence, gain'd opinion from the manifest innocence and sincerity of the Deliverer.

And our Saviour's Answer may be considered,

*First,* As to the prudence and appositeness of the form and phrase.

*Secondly,* As to the truth of the subject Matter.

And our Saviour's prudent choice of such a Reply which might most reasonably avoid the malice and design of the Inquirers, may be a direction to all his Followers to temper their Zeal with prudence, and to avoid all those Indiscretions, that may expose Religion to reproach, or themselves to unnecessary suffering. And had this been well considered, some mens names had been wanting in the Protestant as well as other Martyrologies; our Dissenters had not so vainly flattered themselves under the Penalties and inconveniences of a rash and chosen folly, nor so unreasonably born up against the just authority of their Superiors, with the confidence of a

bogey

B

future

future reward for those scruples, and that disobedience, which are the vain effects of stubbornness and inconsideration: for he that has commanded his Disciples to be *as wise as Serpents as well as innocent as Doves*, and has in his own practice united innocence and discretion, has left no foundation for such idle expectations to his Followers, but as he has recommended the example of his Patience to the imitation of those whom Providence shall call to *the fiery trial*, so he has left the example of his Prudence to direct us in avoiding suffering, when it may consist with the sincerity of faith, and the just obligations of a Christian Profession.

I reflect not on the forward zeal of the Primitive Martyrs, who were under the conduct and direction of extraordinary influence; I question not the raptures of that Spirit which inflamed Saint Paul with a *desire of being dissolved*, nor the wisdom of that grace which enabled those virtuous Hero's, he speaks of, to *endure tortures, not accepting deliverance*; nor the ecstasies of the blessed Ignatius, when he prayed against the prayers and endeavours of his Friends, lest they should rescue him from the glories of his desired Martyrdom: when he

Ep. Ig. ad  
Rom.

longed

longed to be a prey to the greedy Lions, and passionately wished that in this he might be like his Master Christ, that nothing of his Body might be seen on Earth, but that it might be wholly devoured, and no part of it left behind, to be the occasion of sorrow or solemnity, *τὸν μὲν κομψὸν βαρύς τὸν εὐαδίουσαν*, such and the like instances of Christian gallantry, which we reade every-where in the undoubted Epistles of that blessed Martyr, are justified by the extraordinary influences of that Spirit which assisted him with a courage agreeable to the unhappy circumstances of Primitive Christianity.

But under the guidance of an ordinary Providence we ought to keep our stations in the regular methods of duty, neither wishing, nor running into those dangers we may prudently avoid; unaccountable Ecstasies, the effects of an extraordinary Call, are not onely forgiven, but rewarded; but rash Zeal has neither promise nor foundation: for it is an unreasonable contradiction, and can never be the ground of a wise hope to expect to be honoured by our Saviour in Heaven before his Father, for those Actions by which we have dishonoured him on Earth before Men, and brought unnecessary Reproaches upon Religion.

gion. For the Promise is not made to suffering in general, but to such Afflictions only, which though we neither deserve by our faults, nor choose by our follies, meet or overtake us in the ways of obedience, and therefore Saint Peter has excluded all other pretending Sufferers from the comfort and

<sup>1 Pet. 4.19.</sup> glories of Martyrdom. *If you be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are you, but let none of you suffer as a murtherer, as a thief, as an evil doer, or as a busy-body in other mens matters:* which Text, had it been well confidered by all the pretended Followers of that great Apostle, Traitors and Assassines had not been accounted in the number of the Saints of Christendom, nor transmitted with so far a Character in some *Romish* Martyrologies to the dishonour of Christian Religion.

2. Our Saviour's answer may be considered as to the truth of the subject Matter, and then it contains a doctrinal Truth that we are to obey, as well as an example of Prudence that we are to imitate; for as our Saviour is essentially the eternal Word, so are the words of his mouth to endure, when *Heaven and Earth shall pass away*; his Discourses were not like those of frail and mortal Men, particular and temporary, to serve onely present interest and special

special circumstance, but of universal consequence, and to remain a Law for ever; what he said to his Disciples, he said to all, *Watch*; and what he says here to the *Pharisees* and *Herodians*, he says to all Subjects and Men, *Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's.*

Which words may be considered as containing two distinct Commands, and then they afford us two large Themes of discourse, one comprehending all the Duties of Subjects, whether Obedience, Tribute, Prayers, Assistance, or any other of the Parts and Offices of Loyalty; the other in a large acceptance comprising that, and the whole duty of Man, but in a more special and proper sense, the particular obligations of Religion, that duty we owe to God in distinction from the Laws of Justice, Temperance and Charity.

But I shall rather consider the two Commands of the Text jointly in relation to one another, and the design of our Saviour's answer; and from both thus considered, infer this general Proposition: *That God's and Cesar's dues neither do, nor can contradict one another*; that is, no Pretences of Religion can make void our just obligations to the Supreme

preme Magistrate, nor any humane authority dispence with our duty to God Almighty: in which there are two parts; but the first being the more principal design of our Saviour in this place, shall be the subject of this present discourse.

A Proposition that would need neither proof nor defence, had not the opinions and practices of some Christians rendred it doubtfull and suspicious; and indeed we have reason to complain, that some unhappy Zealots of that name have done the blessed *Jesus* that dishonour and reproach which the *Jews* could not effect by their curning and artifice; having by their Doctrines publickly represented him to be, what the others did but tempt him to appear *an enemy unto Cæsar*; and that by three things:

1. By pretending from the Laws of Christianity Arguments against the Lawfulness and Authority of the Magistrate's Office.
2. By mis-interpreting some of the Obligations of Christian Religion, to make void the Subject's Duty and Obedience.
3. By asserting an Ecclesiastical Supremacy, erected by our Saviour, with authority to correct and depose Princes, absolve Subjects, and dispose of Temporal Dominions.

These

These three destructive Propositions to Government are severally asserted by Christians of different persuasions, and contended for as truths delivered in the body of the Christian Doctrine: But as directly against the words, as the design of our Saviour in this Text; for he that has required us to give *Cesar* his dues, has owned the Right of the Magistrate's authority, and the necessity of the Subject's duty, and has left no place for the two first pretences; and he that has united *Cesar's* and God's dues as things agreeing and consistent, and left both within their ancient limits and boundaries, cannot be supposed by any new Ecclesiastical Supremacy to have contradicted the Magistrate's Authority, or to have given countenance to any Doctrine of that nature.

And indeed to any man that considers the many necessities and benefits of Government, and the great use and advantage of the Magistrate's Office; it cannot but seem a very ridiculous undertaking to pretend to argue against them from any Topick whatsoever, but more especially to fetch those Arguments from Christianity, a Law exactly framed to promote and establish the temporal happiness of men.

And

And yet some great pretenders to Reason, and zealous assertors of the Excellency and Perfection of the Christian Institution, have been so unjust to their own pretences, as to endeavour to demonstrate the Magistrate's authority repugnant to the Laws of Christian Religion: But in this they do not perfectly agree amongst themselves, for some wholly reject the Magistrate's Power, as entirely unlawfull, neither to be undertaken nor executed by a Christian under the pain of damnation; others more moderately allowing the preeminence, legislature, judicial proceeding in all civil and some criminal causes, deny only coercive Power, capital punishment, and the use of Arms to the Christian Magistrate: And here again they are subdivided, some making the exercise of these Powers a direct and formal sin in any one that professes the Christian Religion, others only a defect and imperfection which ought to be reformed and amended, as he improves and grows in the Christian Spirit.

And thus far *Brennius* has proceeded in the two Epistles, printed before his Works, to mitigate this harsh and unacceptable opinion: For after he had asserted that a due execution of the Magistrate's Office, according to the rules

rules of Equity and Justice, might be a laudable virtue in an *Infidel*, and had upon that put himself the question how it could be then unlawfull to a Christian, he softens his answer by asserting some Laws of Perfection that oblige the Christian, to which the Infidel is not bound, against which the offence is not properly a sin, but only a defect and imperfection; and then applying it to the Case, he puts again the Question, whether if a Christian undertake the Magistrate's office, he may exercise coactive power, to which he coldly answers, *Excusatur in eo ac toleratur utpote adhuc infirmo, tam diu donec in Christo maiores accepent vires*, he is forgiven and exercised till more perfectly instructed and better assisted. But is not this to lessen the honour, use, and necessity of the Magistrate's office? is not this to make Christianity alter the nature of things? to change Dignity into defect, Laudable into Imperfect, Usefull into bare tolerable, and Necessary into unlawfull?

Whatsoever this Opinion says, it seems to pretend something inconsistent with the temper and laws of Christian Religion, as will appear by two Arguments.

First, Because the rights of Government, and authority of Magistrates are founded in the primary necessities and inclinations of humane nature.

Second, Because Christianity has by several Laws of her own, confirmed and established the Magistrates authority.

1. It is agreed by all, that humane Nature does as well need as incline us to Society, although it be under dispute whether Love or Fear be the principle of this necessity and inclination; and it is as generally granted that all Society infers Order, and all Order supposes the duties of Inferiors and Superiors, and the necessity of some coercive power to secure the relation and dependance of the several parts of this Community. For they are propositions equally true and evident, that Society is necessary, and that humane Societies cannot be preserved in virtue, peace, and happiness, without the influences of Government, and Authority of Magistrates, and the truth of both stands alike demonstrated, from the inclinations of Nature, the conclusions of Reason, and the universal practice of Mankind:

And

And therefore it will be a ridiculous opinion to affirm the Magistrate's office unlawfull, because 'tis an office as necessary to the being of Society, as that is to the happiness of Man; for there cannot be a more unworthy reflexion upon the wisedom and goodness of God, than to say he has so ill contrived the World, that the temporal happiness of Mankind cannot be preserved, unless some Men endanger their Eternal to secure it.

And what Nature has so univerſally concluded usefull and necessary, cannot be render'd unlawfull by any Revelation whatſoever; for where the circumstances, necessities and inclinations of Nature remain as they were, the ſame ſupplies will be always reaſonable which Nature directs to; and it will be to attribute injustice to God, to ſuppoſe him in any circumstance to forbide the pro- vifion, where he has not changed the neceſſity.

But it is much more unreasonable, to pretend this alteration from the Doctrines of Christian Religion, because a Law ſo exactly composed for the ſatisfaction and perfection of humane Nature, a Law that has in all things consulted the temporal peace and hap-

piness of Men, and prescribed the most perfect measures of equity and obedience to execute them, a Law delivered by so mercifull a Legislator, that he himself assumed humanity, that he might with a sense and feeling of our infirmities relieve and pity us agreeably to the necessities and inclinations of our Natures, consider this, and there cannot be a more absurd contradiction to the equity of this Law, and the mercy of its Legislator, than to say that Christianity has subverted the foundations of Government, and made the miseries of Anarchy necessary to all that embrace it.

Had Christian Religion made a thorough reformation in the World, and perfectly subdued the Passions and Inclinations of Men to an exact obedience to the Laws of Temperance, Justice, and Charity, there had been no more need of Magistrates on Earth than in Heaven it self; but since the temporal Circumstances of the World are much the same they were, and Christendom as well as other Parts inhabited with good and bad, since there appetite prevails as well as in other Countries, and Christians as well as Infidels are angry and covetous, hate and desire, discontented with what they have, and greedy of

of more, subject to the temptations of the World and Flesh, apt to forget the considerations of Eternity, inclined to be led by temporal Hopes and Fears, and still conducted by the influences of Grace in ways and methods agreeable to a reasonable Nature, there will be always the necessity of a coactive Power to set bounds to Appetite and Passion, to make Men vertuous and peaceable, and to defend those that are so, from those that are not.

Now since these are the circumstances in which *Christ* left us, and in all these a Magistrate is a necessary and usefull Instrument of publick benefit, and to be publickly beneficial will be always praise-worthy, it cannot without the greatest contradiction to sense and reason be either a sin or imperfection for a Christian to execute the Magistrate's Office.

2. Christianity has by several Laws of her own confirmed and established the Magistrate's Authority, and therefore is most unreasonably traduced for condemning it; that Religion that has asserted the Magistrate's power to be from God, and ordained by God, that has styled and own'd him the Officer and Minister of God; that has acknowledged the use and benefit.

benefit of that Office to be in general *for our good*, and in particular *for the terror of evil doers, and the praise of them that doe well*, and has therefore enjoined us to *pay him tribute because he is God's Minister, attending continually on this very thing*: that Religion that hath peremptorily required a univerſal ſubjection, *Let every Soul be ſubject*, and that not outward, and hypocritical, but hearty and ſincere, *not only for wrath, but Conscience-fake*; that Religion that hath commanded us to obey upon the best principles and moſt laſting conſiderations, with a regard to his Authority that has conſtituted theſe powers, and required our ſubmiſſion, *Submit your ſelves to every ordinance of Man for the Lord's fake*; that Religion that has threatned to every Reſiſter Eternal *damnation*, and has given it as a note of Hereticks, that they are *Traitors, despise Dominions, and ſpeak evil of Dignities*, cannot without the greateſt contradiction be ſuppoſed to diſapprove of the Magiſtrate's authority.

<sup>1 Pet. 2.</sup>  
<sup>13.</sup> Can any greater character be given of any power, than to derive its original from God Almighty? can any ſtronger Argument be urged for any duty, than to require it for God's fake? can any Obedience be more real

real and perfect, than that which has its foundation in the heart and conscience? holy Scripture would certainly never have taken such care of the Magistrate's honour and the Subjects duty, had it supposed the Magistrate's power unlawfull and Antichristian.

That Religion that has made Kings and Princes the especial Subjects of the publick offices of the Church: *I exhort that first of all Supplication, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for Kings and all in authority,* and that not that they may resign their powers, but that they may so rule and govern us, that *under them we may leade a peaceable and quiet life in all godliness and honesty;* that Religion that has made Peace and Piety her principal commands, and has own'd both to be preserved by the influences of good Government, and has commanded us to pray for our Governors upon that account, cannot be supposed to have disallowed Christians so necessary an instrument of their Eternal as well as Temporal happiness: That Religion that has owned an *Oath the end of all Strife,* and yet forbidden all Oaths in private converse, must be necessarily supposed to allow jural Process, and the Magistrates authority.

And

And yet, against all this Demonstration, it is pretended that the Magistrate's office is repugnant and inconsistent with some of the most principal obligations of Christian Religion, and those are particularly the great and necessary duties of Humility and Charity: To the first, the Eminence, superiority, and pomp of Magistrates seems repugnant, to the other judicial Process and capital Penalties.

And to justify the first pretence, they cite Text and our Saviour's own opinion in the case, for being requested by his Disciples to rebuke the pride of the Sons of Zebedee, he takes occasion of reflecting on the power of Princes, and gives a command to his followers in direct opposition to the Authority

March. 20.  
25, 26. assumed and exercised by them: *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise Authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you.*

This Text has been frequently abused, and to different purposes, sometimes it is alledged by the Defenders of the gifted Brotherhood, to prove against the office Ministerial in general, agreeably to the spirit and style of Corah and his Accomplices, *Ye take too much*

much upon you, since all the Congregation is ho-  
ly: Sometimes it is urged by the Patrons of  
the equality of the Gospel-Ministry, to re-  
proach the dignity and superiority of the of-  
fice Episcopal, sometimes by the Levelling  
Spirit to make void the just rights and au-  
thority of the Civil Magistrate, but to as little  
purpose pretended by the latter as either of  
the former, as will appear by three Argu-  
ments.

*First,* Because in this place where our *Sa-*  
*viour* is said to prohibit, he has owned and  
supposed a superiority amongst Christians,  
and therefore what is here in St. Matthew,  
*δέ λέειν μέγας γένεσθαι, whosoever will be great, is* v. 26.  
in St. Luke *δέ μείζων, δέ μέγιστος, he that is great,* Luke 22. 26.  
*he that is chief amongst you,* implying a law-  
full greatness and superiority amongst Chri-  
stians, as well as those of other Religions, so  
it be temper'd and exercised with meekness  
and moderation.

*Secondly,* The superiority of Princes is no  
more inconsistent with Christian humility and  
the doctrine of the Text alledged, than Pater-  
nal Dominion, from whence it took its origi-  
nal, or the Authority of Husbands and

D Masters,

Masters, which are all severally owned and asserted in the *New Testament*, but more especially by St. *Paul*, who was an eminent Follower of *Christ*, in his humility as well as other vertues: Children are to be *kept in sub-*

<sup>1 Tim. 3.4.</sup> *jection, μετὰ πάντας σεβομένοις, with all gravity,*

<sup>1 Tim. 2.11.</sup> *Wives are to live in silence, μετὰ πάντων ταπεινόης, with all subjection;*

<sup>Eph 6.5.</sup> *Servants are to be obedient to their Masters with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart as unto Christ;*

And since none of these are allowed to plead the consequences of Christian Humility against the commands of their Domestick Superiors, neither ought the Subject against the higher Powers.

*Thirdly, The consequence of this Argument as it is urged by the Objectors, would make our Saviour's own Authority over his Apostles, unjust and Antichristian, and this consideration ought to be of particular force in interpreting this place, because our Saviour has proposed his own practice for the pattern and example of that Humility he requires of his Followers, For the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister;* and therefore since the most perfect in all things is the rule and measure of Rectitude to the lesser degrees,

degrees, no consequence can be deduced from Christian Humility to oblige us, which will not obtain and take place in the original and most perfect example of Christian Humility; since therefore our great Master at that time that he delivered this Doctrine, and recommended it by his own practice, owned and exercised an authority over his Disciples, *Ye call me Lord and Master, and ye say well, for so I am*; we ought not to conclude from the consequences of Christian Humility against the authority of Princes, least we make an Argument against our *Saviour's* own authority.

2. But Secondly it is pretended that Juridical proceedings and Capital punishments, without which, neither the Prince's authority, nor the Subjects rights, can be secured, are directly repugnant to the obligations of Christian Charity.

1. Juridical proceedings, for by the Law of Christian Charity, we are commanded to forgive all injuries, which are the very subject-matter of legal process; injuries to the Body, *To him that striketh thee on the right cheek, turn the other*; injuries in property, to

Matt. 5.

39.

Matt. 5.  
40, 41.

him that taketh thy coat, give him thy cloak also; injuries in Liberty, with him that compelleth thee to go one mile, go twain; and all this we have asserted by our Saviour himself, when he published and stated the just bounds of the Christian Law.

But our Saviour's words may be more reasonably interpreted, more agreeably to the Analogy of Scripture, and the nature of true Charity, if we consider the prohibition under these limitations.

1. If we suppose him to forbid, not publick justice and legal procedure, but private returns of injury, and forcible recovery of right without Law and Authority; and this seems very consonant to the purport and design of the Text, for it instances in such prejudices of our right which are usually done by force and private insolence, and therefore may be properly interpreted to prohibit returns of the like nature; and such are, indeed against Christian Charity, because generally attended with partiality, malice and revenge; and this may be allowed for one good interpretation of the prohibition, notwithstanding *xeiðnva*, a *forensick* word is used in the fortieth verse, and in that sense rendered by our Tranfla-

Translators, because that word is sometimes in good Authours apply'd to signify any sort of contention as well as legal, and therefore may be reasonably so interpreted in this place, both in conformity to the other instances of the Text, and to Saint Luke's reading, who uses *ἀλογία* instead of *Ἄρχειν*.

2. If we suppose him to forbid not legal process in general, but a litigious disposition to contend even at Law it self, for every trifle, and this *Grotius* collects from the nature of the instances in the Text objected; and this indeed is not onely against Christian Charity, but also the peace and interest of Society, and therefore all good Governments discourage and forbid it.

3. If we suppose him to forbid only malice and revenge in all prosecutions of right and returns of injury, for it is not onely possible, but our duty to demand justice without desire of revenge; and to seek recompence by Law, and yet forgive injuries; but he that goeth to Law with malice and hatred to the person that has wronged him, unhallows his proceedings, though never so legal: The same Argument that is urged in the *New Testa-*

*Heb. 10.**30.**Deut. 32.**35.*

Testament to perswade Christians to forgive, because *vengeance is God's, and he will repay it*, was also delivered to the *Jews* in the *Old*, when yet there were Magistrates, Punishments, Laws and Courts of Judicature erected and approved by God himself; and therefore there may be Proceedings at Law now, amongst the Christians, as well as formerly amongst the *Jews* without revenge.

4. If we suppose him in some cases to have limited and forbidden the customary and usual returns of injury amongst the *Jews*, even by legal and publick process, such was their cruel way of retaliation of *an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth*, by which no recompence was made to the injured, but onely a misery inflicted on the Injurer; this way of satisfaction seems repealed by our Saviour, and repugnant to Christian Charity, because it gratifies so much the natural desire of revenge, and so much resembles it.

*Secondly*, Capital Punishments are not repugnant to Christian Charity.

1. Because Christian Charity must be guided and distinguished by the Rules of Justice and

and Prudence; by the Laws of Charity we are bound to love universally, but not equally; to hate no body, yet not to exercise the same degrees of affection to every one; for as there are particular obligations, qualifications and endearments in the objects of our love, so the measures of our Charity may and ought to be distinguished accordingly; and therefore although the Magistrate be by duty bound to have a common Charity for all his Subjects, yet he not onely may, but must prefer the good of the Innocent before that of the Profligate, and the publick Welfare before the Safety of any single Man; and in all his particular acts of Charity to behave himself, that he be neither unjust to the whole, nor any part of the Community.

2. Because Christian Charity cannot offend where it observes the best rule and most perfect example of Charity. Now God himself, who is Love, in his own judicial Laws delivered to the Jews, made many Crimes capital, and by a more ancient Sanction has made Murther eternally so, *He that sheddeth Gen. 9. 16.  
Man's blood, by Man shall his blood be shed;* and if there be but one instance of capital Penalty consistent with Christian Charity,

the

the Argument objected will be insufficient, especially since there is so much reason to believe there may be many, the Magistrate in these being the Minister of divine Wrath, and excusable both by the Authority he bears, and the Example he imitates.

3. Christian Charity cannot oblige us to act in smaller instances, against the greater rules of Charity; Shall Charity to a part hazard the interest of the whole? shall the Gangreend Member be spared to the ruine of the Man? shall pity to a few Malefactours oblige the Magistrate to expose the lives of the rest of his Subjects to the uncharitable mercy of unpunished Profligates? Must he take care to forgive and deliver him that deserves to dye, and not those rather that are ready to be slain by him that he forgives? Must he spare the life of a capital Sinner for fear he should go to Hell too soon, and teach thousands by his impunity to commit those crimes which lead thither? Must the Government be Charitable to the Subjects and unjust to it self? Must the Magistrate in pity forgive the Murtherer, and with cruelty entail upon himself and Family the guilt and curses of unrevenged Bloud? Christian Charity

city as it begins so it takes its measures at home, and therefore no Magistrate can be bound by the Laws of Charity to contradict the necessary rules and ends of Government, for since he is appointed by God a terror for evill doers, he must neglect no Penalty, no not Capital, if necessary, to promote Piety and deter Wickedness, for as he *bears the Sword*, so he must not *bear it in vain*, lest whilst by his Charity he endeavours to establish a mild and mercifull Government, he render it most cruel to the Souls of his Subjects. *Tam omnibus ignoscere crudelitas est quam nullo;* It is as great cruelty to forgive every one as to forgive none.

2. The second sort of those who would make Christ an enemy to Cesar, are such as own the lawfulness of the Magistrate's authority and yet set up Christian-liberty and tender Conscience against the lawfull commands of their Superiours, and would by misinterpreting some of the obligations of Christian Religion, make void that authority which they own to be confirmed and established by Christian Religion;

E they

they acknowledge St. Peter's command,  
*Submit your selves to every ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake*, and yet think themselves safe in disobeying the lawfull impositions of Government with a pretence of doing it *for the Lord's sake*; they own St. Paul's authority and the truth of his Doctrine, that *whosoever resists shall receive damnation*, and yet dare not apply the necessary consequence of the Text for the security of the Government, by affirming it *unlawfull to take up Arms against their Prince upon any pretence whatsoever*.

But is not this to make Christian Religion contradict it self in its most peremptory and evident commands? for it will be to no purpose by express Doctrines from thence, to urge the rights of the Magistrate's authority, and the necessity of the Subjects duty, if by the consequence of the same Religion both may be superseded and avoided by the persuasions, opinions, doubts and mistakes of every Conscience; and Christianity will be unreasonably proposed as the most exact law for the peace and obedience of

of Man, whilst Principles so apt to disturbance and ruin Government, are pretended ~~for~~ <sup>from</sup> it; and therefore it will be easie to determine in such a case, since there is no other choice left us but either conclude for the Authority of Government against all such pretences, or to affirm that our *Saviour* has deliver'd a body of inconsistent Doctrines; And indeed most Men that have taken up this Principle, have in the manage of it betrayed so much willfulness and obstinacy under all their pleas of Conscience and Tenderness, that it is evident they rather chose it as an Argument to gratifie their Pride in some cases, than from a conviction of its force and strength in all; and this appears by the great partiality they express to the consequences of this pretence, when others plead it against them where they are in power to command, or command them what they have a mind to obey, and therefore those very men could once with confidence, by virtue of an Usurped Power, determine indifferent rites in Religion, that cannot now

allow it to the just Authority of their lawfull Superiours, and could quietly obey those that forbade kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that now refuse Obedience to that Church that commands it: And yet Christian Liberty is their Plea, which does by as direct a consequence conclude against themselves, as their Governours, and is as apt to infer the Negative as the Affirmative Precept un lawfull.

The same Contradiction they practise in other cases, for the Principle pretended would also conclude against the Political Laws of State, and the Domestick Orders of Families, were they not resolved to be partial, and to allow its consequences only where they have an inclination to dissent and disobey. The power of Parents and Masters they grant to others and exercise themselves, and never permit that pretence of Liberty to their Children and Servants, which they plead against the commands of Government. The Magistrate must not determine the Ceremonies

monies of Publick Devotion, and yet they may, the circumstances of Family Duty, the Time, the Place, the Psalm, the Chapter, the Repetition, and all the Rites of their Domestick Offices are bounded and stated, and none allowed to dispute them, only the liberty of Impertinence is preserved as the undoubted privilege of the Master of the Family, which he tyrannically imposes on the affections of his Dependents, and requires *Amens* as sudden and *extempore* as his effusions.

But this is to make Humour the rule of Conscience, and to set up our own Wills against the evident Commands of holy Scripture; for since God has enjoyedne every one to obey the Magistrate, no Man ought to disobey him, who has not very good assurance of God's allowance or command to doe it; the usual pretences of Liberty, Scruple, Tenderness, and Conscience are so often mistaken for Prejudice, Perversenes, Passion, and Interest, that they more frequently encrease the guilt of the disobedience than excuse it; but would Men consider more the Authority that Princes represent, that they have their

their original from God, are his Deputies and Vicegerents upon Earth; his *Ministers for our good*, and *the revengers of his wrath upon evil doers*, that they command by virtue of a power delegated from him, and are to be obey'd by virtue of his Command, given to us, they would not so easily satisfy themselves with every trifling excuse for a disobedience to a humane Law: did they believe *Cesar's Rights* established by Divine Authority, they would not by such idle pretences of Religion be unjust to *Cesar*, upon presumption of paying God his due; but in a regular conformity to the Laws of God and Man, serve and obey God for his own sake, and *Cesar* for God's sake.

3. The third sort of those that would make *Christ* an enemy to *Cesar*, are those who pretend an Ecclesiastical Supremacy erected by our Saviour, and settled in a visible Head, with authority to correct and depose Princes, to absolve Subjects, and dispose of temporal Dominions: But is it not great injustice to our Lord and Master, who was so carefull of *Cesar's Rights*,

Rights, when he was upon Earth, and with so much strictness enjoined his Followers to observe them; to pretend, when he is gone to Heaven, a grant of them all into the Churches hands? has he not particularly in this Text both united and stated God's and Cesar's dues? and by that taught us that they neither interfere, nor contradict one another? was not his whole life one continued exercise of meekness and submission? was there one act by which he assumed a supremacy to himself, or signified an intended supremacy after his departure? did not the Apostles also after him enjoin the strictest subjection in every Christian (not excepting themselves, nor their Successors) to those that bore the Sword; that is, to the Civil, as the higher powers? Nay, did not St. Peter, even when supposed in the Chair of *Rome*, assert this Temporal Supremacy; *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man, to the King as supreme*? did not the Apostle understand the Rights of the See? could he be ignorant of, or deceived in so fundamental an Article as his own and his Successors supremacy? or did he only mean to compliment Princes till some

<sup>1 Pet. 2.</sup>

<sup>13.</sup>

some fitter opportunity of publishing it? to say he erred, will bring in question the authority of the Chair, for that that erred in the original, will scarce become infallible in the succession; to say he counterfeited and concealed the truth, will be an impardonable reproach upon an Apostle and Minister of Truth; and therefore it will be most reasonable to conclude from such commands of the blessed Apostles, for the Civil Magistrate's supremacy against all the pretences of a Spiritual supremacy, lest we lay the foundation of invalidating the authority of all their inspired Writings, by making the Infallible Inspirer in some to contradict himself.

But this Papal Supremacy has been variously managed, and differently asserted, for some denying the Bishop of *Rome* all authority in Matters temporal, do yet assert him to be by Divine Right *Christ's* Vicar, and the Supreme Pastor of the Catholick Church, with a spiritual empire over all Christians, as well as Subjects; and this has been formerly and of late years the opinion of some learned Men of the *Roman* communion, but generally distastfull

printed

distastful to the Court of *Rome*, and in *Bellarmin's* Language, *Non tam sententia quam heresis*. Others, denying all direct Power in Temporals, have yet reserved him such an indirect Power in order to Spiritual Good, and the preservation of the Rights of Holy Church, that may suffice to serve and gratifie the utmost pretences of the *Roman Chair*; and therefore I cannot but wonder at *Sixtus the Fifth's* Quarrel with *Bellarmin's* Controversie for this Distinction: for altho' he pretends to limit and reserve in expression, yet in reality and by consequence he gives the same absolute and unlimited Supremacy they contend for.

But since this is not enough, there are others who speak more plainly, such as *Baronius*, and most of the *Canonists*, who without mincing or shuffling, assert a Supreme universal direct Temporal Power by Divine Right over the whole World, and whatsoever private persons may think or dispute, this last Opinion has gain'd the Reputation, and is most agreeable to the public Claims of the Court of *Rome*, as is evident from the several *Decretals*, *Bulls*, *Constitutions*, and *Rescripts* relating to this Matter.

When *Gregorij the Seventh* undertook to transfer the Imperial Crown from *Henry the Fourth* to *Rodolphus*, he founded his right of Disposal upon the Gift of Christ to *St. Peter* and his Successors at *Rome*. The *Rescript* of *Alexander the Sixth*, to *Ferdinand* and *Isabella of Portugal*, pretends to give to them, their Heirs and Successors, all the *American* Lands that were then unpossessed by other *Christian* Princes, or should be afterwards discovered, *Authoritate omnipotentis Dei & Vicariatus Iesu Christi*, by the Authority of the Omnipotent God, and the Vicarship of Christ. The *Bulls* of *Pius the Fifth*, against *Queen Elizabeth*, and of *Sixtus the Fifth* against *Henry the Third of France*, do both claim a Supreme Power by Divine Institution over all Kings and Princes of the World, and over all People, Nations, and Countries; so that whatsoever are their pretences at first of quarrelling Temporal Princes, they all ultimately resolve into this universal, absolute, supreme, and unaccountable Power.

Against all these Pretences as they more or less prejudice and usurp the just Rights of the Civil Magistrate, I shall argue in Four Propositions.

1. By proving that these Pretences are inconsistent with that Supremacy that belongs to *Christian Princes* in Right of their Crowns, *in all Causes, and over all Persons as well Civil as Ecclesiastical* within their own Dominions.

2. That the Spiritual Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, is neither sufficient as to Extent or Power for such a Pretence.

3. That the pretended Title of Christ's Vicar were it true, doth neither Infer nor Imply Temporal Jurisdiction.

4. That Spiritual Power in its greatest Latitude, without direct Temporal, will not suffice to justify the Claim.

First, That these Pretences are inconsistent, &c. For since all Power that is entire and perfect, must have sufficient Authority to execute that duty, and defend that charge, which falls within its care and cognizance; it necessarily follows that no Affairs nor Persons can be exempt from his Jurisdiction, who is Invested with the Right of Government, more especially not the Affairs of Religion;

Religion, because they do not only make up a great part of the Interests of Mankind, but have also such a necessary Power, extent and influence on all other Causes, and over all Persons whatsoever, that no Government can secure it self from ruin and disturbance which has not a Conduct and Superiority in these. For as Religion is the best and most excellent Principle of Political Happiness under good manage; so it is very liable to abuse and apt to serve Malice and Design; for hither the Seditious and Malecontented flee to Arm themselves and their Abbettors with offensive and defensive Weapons, Principles of Resistance and Disobedience: And therefore no Proposition does more directly tend to disturb the Peace, and subvert the Interests of Society, than that, that affirms the Affairs of Religion to be under the Influence and Authority of a Spiritual Supreme, distinct from the Government. For since it is the most Fundamental and necessary Right of Government, for every Prince to prescribe the measures of Peace and Obedience within his own Dominions, it will be always unreasonable for any other Power by right of spiritual Jurisdiction to interpose by limiting, suspending, or disannulling

annulling their Obligation, and therefore the *Romish Subjects* of the *English Crown* do vainly pretend Exemption from our Legal Tests, and the Public service of our Church, by virtue of a Foreign Authority which has forbid them, contrary to the Laws of their Supreme, as well as ours, who has established them as Rules to secure the Peace and Allegiance of his Subjects; and indeed the most moderate Assertors of the *Papal Supremacy*, do destroy one entire part of the Government, by exempting the Consciences of Subjects in all Matters Spiritual, where the *Papal Edicts* forbid Obedience, as truly as the more fierce by extending the Rights of that Power to Deposing Princes, and Absolving Subjects, do subvert the whole.

And therefore a Supremacy in Spiritual Matters and the Affairs of Religion, was in all Ages allowed to Temporal Princes, as their undoubted and inseparable Prerogative; and this not only the *Heathen*, but also the *Jewish Kings* exercised; which is so evident a Pattern to *Christian Princes*, that our Church has adjudged those to Excommunication, that *shall deny the Supreme Civil Power*: Now the same Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical which the Kings of Judea had, and of

of their Practice the *Old Testament* is a sufficient Record; by which it evidently appears they interposed both in Regulating the Ceremonies, and Correcting the Officers of Religion: For as *David* order'd the Court of the *Levites*, and the Solemnities of the Public Service to *Solomon*, Deposed *Abiathar* from the Priesthood; and therefore when the *Jews* had afterwards relapsed to Idolatry, and corrupted their Worship with *Pagan* Rites, *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* succeeding, undertook two public Reformations, and by pulling down of Idols, burning of Groves, removing Idolatrous Priests and Ceremonies, restored the purity of the *Jewish* Worship, and the Religion of the God of *Israel*: And upon the Reason of this Argument, the Canons of Sixteen hundred and forty have Established the Supremacy of Christian Princes. *The Care of Religion is so committed to Kings in Holy Scripture, that they are commended when the Church takes the right way, and taxed when she goes amiss; and therefore, her Government belongs in Chief to Kings, or else one man would be commended for another's Care, and taxed for another's Negligence, which is not God's way, as the Canon argues.*

Can. I.

And

1. And it is ridiculous to suppose this Ancient right of Princes diminished by Christian Religion, which has altered nothing of the Rights and Properties of public or private Persons, but left the states and conditions of Men as they were, and consequently the same Power Supreme, that was so formerly, and therefore the Ecclesiastical Supremacy was never pretended in the Church, till Luxury and Ambition brought it in; but in the best and more primitive Ages of Christianity, the Civil Power was always esteemed Supreme, and the Spiritual exercised with Subordination and Submission to that; and of this it is a sufficient proof that the four first General Councils, to which the Catholic Church has given great honour, and the Laws of England a particular difference, were all convened by Imperial Edict, and their Decrees confirmed by Imperial Sanction.

Eliz. c. 2.  
S. 36.

2. The Spiritual Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, is neither sufficient as to extent, or power for this pretence: For since he claims his Universal Dominion over all Princes, in right of his Spiritual Authority, to censure and Excommunicate; if this latter be proved particular limited, and defective, the other founded in that must be so too, and it

is

is but reasonable to enquire into the foundation and limits of that power, from whence are deduced Consequences so mischievous and prejudicial to the Peace and Interest of *Christendom*; and yet all this depends upon the bare supposal of his being Universal Pastor, for there is no demonstration yet produced, either to prove Christ did constitute such an Officer, or that *St. Peter* was he; or that it was to descend to a Successor, or that the Chair of Succession was to be at *Rome*.

For suppose all the privileges of *St. Peter* as great as the *Romanists* pretend, they are such as are in common with him ascribed to the Bishops and Pastors of the Church: Was the Church said to be *built on him*? it was but on him as one part of the Foundation, for it was also supported by the rest of the *Prophets and Apostles*; *Jesus Christ* being

<sup>Eph. 2. 20.</sup> *the chief corner stone*: Had he the *power of the Keys* given him by *Christ*? so had also the rest of the Apostles. Was he commanded

<sup>St. John 20. 23.</sup> *to feed Christ's Sheep*? so are the Bishops of the Church, and by *St. Peter* too; *Feed the*

<sup>1 Pet. 5. 2.</sup> *Flock of Christ which is among you, and have the oversight thereof*. And when this is said, there will remain but little demonstration

to

to prove the Supremacy of St. Peter, and yet less to establish the Universal Authority of the *Roman Church*.

For that was so unknown to Antiquity, that three of the four first General Councils, do by Canons allow and confirm the like privileges to the Churches of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, and *Hierusalem*, within their own liberties, which belong to the Church of *Rome*, within hers, as will appear by the several Canons of those Councils relating to that matter: and notwithstanding the great difficulties that arise from the various readings of some of these Canons, or which have been invented by persons interested in the Usurpation of Churches to obscure them; yet two things are very evident from them to our present purpose.

6 Can.  
Nic.  
7. Can.  
3 Can.  
Conf.  
28 Can.  
Chalced.

1. That the *Roman Church* has no Universal Jurisdiction over all Christian Churches, the Catholic Church having in general Council stated and confirmed the like independent privileges, as proper to other Churches, and not subject to her Authority.

2. That the Church of *Rome* has not so much as an honorary precedence by Divine right, but only Ecclesiastical Constitution: and therefore, as the Fathers of *Constantino-*

ple and Chalcedon, do resolve the honour of the *Roman Chair* into the dignity of the Imperial City, so upon the like account they decree a precedence to the *Constantinopolitan Throne*, because that City was become the Seat of the *Eastern Empire*.

I shall not now dispute how much of her ancient honour the *Roman Church* has lost, the Catholic reason of her precedence being totally ceased by the remove of the Empire, but rather conclude from what has been said, the truth of the first part of our Proposition, That the *Papal spiritual Supremacy* is not universal, but limited within a proper Patriarchat; and therefore the power claim'd as a Consequent of that, must be particular and determined.

But the Bishop of *Rome's* power of Deposing, even within his own Districts, will be further questionable if he has no right of Excommunicating Princes; for if Princes be not liable to such Church Censures, the whole Fabric of the *Papal Monarchy* falls for want of a Foundation, and this Assertion is not without pretence of Reason to justify it.

1. Because Excommunication seems to imply something repugnant with the Subject's necessary and indispensable Obligations

to

to Princes, as a consequent of Excommunication; the Conversation of the Excommunicate is to be avoided, and all civil Offices from the Neighbourhood are under penalties forbidden and suspended, and for the Church to inflict her Censures with such Consequences upon the Supreme Magistrate, would be to pretend by her Authority to contradict the natural Allegiance of Subjects, and those Rights the Prince had from God independently on Religion. The method of Excommunication is to lead the sinner by shame and disgraces to Repentance, a Method as unsuitable to the Majesty of Princes, as the Nature of their Office, and the Ends of Government; for if Reputation and Fame be necessary to preserve their Authority, and make the Government prosperous, nothing can be more unreasonable than disgraceful Penalties, which render them both weak and contemptible: If those Princes are most feared, and best obeyed, who are most Venerable and best esteemed, nothing can be more to the prejudice of Virtue and Religion, than to put that Authority under Disgrace, which was Instituted for the Terror of Evil Doers, and the Praise of them that do well. If all Subjects are required, and that

by the Laws of *Holy Writ*, not to imagine Evil of their Prince in their hearts, what can be more improper than to censure them to the state of the Excommunicate, whom by the Law of the Apostle, we are to treat and value as a *Heathen and Publican*: And the ill usage that *Robert of France* had, when under Ecclesiastical Censure, is a standing Record in Story of the undecency of such proceedings against *Christian Princes*.

2. Because the issue of Ecclesiastical Censures in *Foro externo* depends so much upon the leave and authority of the Civil Magistrate, that it will be as unjust as ridiculous to execute them upon the supreme Magistrate, from whom they derive that Force and Efficacy: What can bar any from the Conversation of others, but Temporal power? What can banish men from public Assemblies, but Civil Force? And where will these be had against the chief Magistrate, but from himself? And it will be very unreasonable to interdict him public Assemblies, without whose Authority the Church can neither interdict nor assemble publicly.

But since this may seem a nice and difficult Point, I shall offer no more in order to the Resolution of it in general, but by saying,

*Vid. Bishop Tayl. Duct. Dub. Book 3. cap. 4.*

ing, that all Apostolical Censures, recorded in Holy Scripture, were exercised amongst Christians before they were under the Authority of a Christian Magistrate; and that they ought to be used with great regard and respect to the Power of the Civil Magistrate, when it becomes Christian; for since Christ has asserted, that *his Kingdom is not of this World*, no pretence of Spiritual power ought to be exercised to the prejudice and diminishing of that Authority, which the Magistrate Originally had, before he submitted to the Christian Faith.

But setting aside the Controversie in general, whether the Ecclesiastical Authority extends to the power of Excommunicating Princes; It is certain in particular, that this *Papal Pretence* was always questioned within these Dominions, and was denied before those Statutes which restored the Ancient Supremacy of the Kings of *England*: For it was a Report of the Judges in *Edward the Third's* time, that no Excommunication under the *Papal Bulls* was of force to the disabling any man within this Kingdom; and that he, that pleaded such Authority tho' it concerned only the censure of a private Subject, was lyable to the King's Justice; and from

from that Sir Edward Cooke argues well in his Reports in Cawdry's Case, that if Excommunication, being the extreme and final issue of all Suits in the *Roman Court*, be not allowable here; it necessarily follows that no Suit for any Cause tho' spiritual, arising within this Realm ought to be determined by the Bishops of *Rome*, according to an undoubted Maxim of Law, *Frustra expectatur Eventus cuius effectus nullus sequitur.*

3. That the pretended title of Christ's Vicar, were it true, doth neither infer nor imply temporal Jurisdiction, for in the fullest and most ample Acceptation, as *Bellarmin* confesses, it can signify no more than a Deputation of that Power which Christ had when he was upon Earth; and therefore whosoever shall by virtue of that Title assume any power which he then neither claim'd nor exercised, hath both forfeited and contradicted his pretence: And that our Saviour had no Temporal Dominion in his state of Humiliation, is evident both from his Practice and Declaration, he never pretended any; nay more, he affirmed he had none, for when *Pilate* asked him, *Whether he were a King?* Tho' he gives no absolute denial that he was none, yet he peremptorily asserts, *That his Kingdom*

dom was not of this WORLD. And when he was moved to divide an Inheritance betwixt two Brethren, he not only refutes the Motion, but says, in a Phrase, usual in Scripture, of denying by Interrogation, that it was a matter in which he had nothing to do; *Who has made me a Judge or Divider betwixt you?* Luk.2.14.

But how unlike to this practice are the Claims of his pretended Vicar? For as if he had received a Deputation from Christ's Divine Nature, and had represented the Glories of his Exaltation, he assumes a despotic Dominion over the Lives and Properties of Men, and a power of disposing the Kingdoms of the Earth to whom he pleafeth.

4. Spiritual Power in its greatest Latitude, without direct Temporal, will not suffice to justifie the Claim; for what Right has Power purely Spiritual to interpose in Temporal Matters? Or whence can it have force to resist and defeat what shall pretend to oppose it? Must Kings tamely yield their Crowns at the Demand of a Spiritual Supreme? are they so easily affrighted from their Thrones? Or is there Reason they should be at the glittering of a Spiritual sword? Temporal and spiritual Power are wholly distinguished as to act, object, and design,

design, and neither contain nor include one another; for as the Exercise of spiritual Offices cannot be assumed by virtue of a temporal Authority, so neither can temporal Dominion be taken away by spiritual Censures, without temporal Force; and therefore till the Abbettors of this Ecclesiastical Supremacy, shall produce Scripture which commands Princes to resign when fallen under Church Censures, they ought not to pretend a power of Depositing by virtue of a spiritual Authority. Had God who is Supreme Lord of all Property and Dominion, made Crowns forfeitable to his Church by Heresie and ill Government, there might have been some pretence for the Churche's calling in the Assistance of her Temporal Friends to Instate her in the Possessions of God's Forfeitures.

But since she not only wants Force to make her Claim effectual, but also Right to make it just, she ought to avoid all such unreasonable pretences; for the Church can never be said to have a power to do that, which she cannot do justly, much less to do that, which directly contradicts the Ends and Designs of all Ecclesiastical and spiritual Authority, for that always ought to be exercised

creised with intention of Charity, and in order to spiritual Good; and therefore whensoever it is managed for secular Ends, to serve the Malice and Ambition of him that Executes upon the Temporal Rights of the person censured, by transgrefsing the Uses, it exceeds the Bounds and Measures of its own Authority, and it will be hard to demonstrate, notwithstanding the witty Attempts that have been made to abuse the Text, from the Commission of *Pasce Oves*, to S.Peter, his own & Successor's power of killing Wolves; as some are pleased to compliment, those they call *Hereticks*; or of exercising civil force for the Temporal safety and defence of the Catholic Flock.

For this is to Invade the Magistrate's Authority, and to take that Sword out of his hand, which God has given him for the *Terror of evil Doers*: This is to confound those Powers which God has distinguished and limited, and instituted, for several Ends and different Purposes; and if it may be lawful for the Church by an *Ordine ad spiritualia*, where she has no other Authority, to invade the Magistrate's Rights, I doubt not but the civil Magistrate may by the like pretence of an *Ordine ad temporalia*, Usirp upon the

Churche's power, and when the Pretence of Right prevails upon both sides, the difference must be infinite, and the controversie indeterminable.

But it is to little purpose to spend more time in further prosecuting the unreasonableness of the *Papal Supremacy*, since the mutual contradictions of those that defend it, have done it to our hands. For since *Bellarmino*, as he pretends, has demonstrated, that Spiritual Supremacy, cannot infer direct Power in Matters Temporal, and the *Canonists* with the like Demonstration, affirm indirect Power repugnant to the Consequences of pure Spiritual: It will be reasonable to conclude, that the Bishop of *Rome* has neither, till they shall agree amongst themselves which side has the better of the Demonstration.

And from what has been said, it is obvious to conclude, that those men have but little sense of the Honour of *Christian Religion*, that abuse its Name, and pervert its Obligations, to justify *Sedition* and *Rebellion*; who with great Pretences and Zeal for *Christianity*, forsake her in her more principal Commands of meekness, patience, and submission, and defend the Doctrine of Resistance

ance and Disobedience, from those *Holy Scriptures* that have forbidden them, under the penalty of Damnation. That the *Spiritual Power* is never more abused and contradicted, than when it is managed for Secular Ends, to serve the Pride and Ambition of *Ecclesiastics*, upon the Rights and Authority of the Civil Magistrate, which have as evident Divine Institution as the other can pretend to.

That those men do unreasonably appropriate the Title of *Catholic*, who have renounced the most *Catholic Doctrine of Obedience*, and taught Subjects from the Consequences of *Christian Religion*, to Resist, Depose, and Murther Princes.

That those men do as little deserve the Character of Reformed, who have forsaken our Reformation in its Principal and Fundamental Doctrine of the *King's Supremacy*, and renounced the *Protestant Church of England*, in all her Principles of *Christian Loyalty*; who amidst all their Clamours against the *Papal Authority* set up a Popular Supremacy of their own, as repugnant to *Christian Religion*, and the Rights of Princes, as the other can be, who assume by *League and Covenant* a Power to reform an established

Religion, against Law and Authority, and by *Association*, a Pretence to resist the Rights of undoubted Inheritance against Natural and Sworn Allegiance; who while with Justice they complain of the Cruelty of *Popish* Zeal, make use of the worst Principles, of the worst *Sects* of that *Religion*, to serve their Cause and Party, and can allow both the Innocence and Merit of the most horrid Crimes that promote such Ends and Purposes: And indeed all the Enemies of the *Church of England*, how distant soever in other Points, are perfectly united in the Doctrines of *Disobedience*; for though they prosecute them upon different Principles, yet they all agree in one Conclusion against the express Commands of *Holy Scripture*, that it is lawful to resist the *Higher Powers*; and as there is no Point in which they more exactly agree amongst themselves, so there is none in which they more perfectly differ from us.

For as the *Church of England* had the Honour to be at first Reformed, with the Consent and Authority of the Supreme Magistrate; so she has always preserved an entire Duty and Gratitude to that Power that Reformed her, and has so evidently declared

red and asserted an absolute Submission to the Higher Powers; that I doubt not, but I may with truth affirm, that it is as impossible for a true Son of the *Church of England* to be Disloyal in any Circumstances, as for those that Dissent from Her by the Consequence of their Principles, not to be so in some; for since they all assert a Supremacy distinct from the Government, either *Papal* or *Popular*, they will be always at liberty in some Circumstances to Resist or Disobey, as this Supreme shall determine them: and the Government can never be secure of their Obedience, whilst it is in their own power to judge when this Supreme has Right to do so.

2. From hence it necessarily follows, that it is the Duty, Obligation, and Interest of Christian Princes by the Authority of their Laws, and the Influence of their Lives and Examples, to promote the Honour and Success of Christian Religion, and to do that Excellent Institution-Right amongst men, which has so evidently asserted their Rights and Authority, to see that all their Subjects render unto that good God his Dues, who has by express Commands taken such Care

Care of theirs to provide that the Laws, Offices, and Ministry, which our Blessed Saviour has Delivered, Appointed, and Constituted, may be had in due Reverence and Esteem, for what can be more the Interest of Christian Princes, than that those Laws should be sincerely obey'd, of which the Duty of Subjects is one principal part, and that those Offices should be rever'd and Celebrated; in which *Supplications and Intercessions are continually made for Kings, and All in Authority*; than that those Ministers should be secured from Contempt and Ignominy, who have received as one part of their Ministry, the Doctrine of *Submission to the Higher Powers*: And indeed what can be a more reasonable Object of their Care, than the Honour of the Great God of Heaven and Earth, whose Ministers they are, and whose Authority they represent; for this is not only a just Expression of their Gratitude to him that has called them to so great a Trust, but the best Method of securing the Interest and Honour of their Office in this World, and the Reward of it in the next, *which and nothing else*.

3, Lastly, By as direct Consequence it appears to be our general Duty and Interest,

to

to heartily embrace and practise that Excellent Religion which has reconciled all our Hopes and Interests, by uniting our Obedience to God and Man, that we may neither dishonor Christianity by Invading the Rights of our Neighbors, or disturbing the Peace of Society, under pretences of Religion, nor betray our Consciences by a prophane neglect of our Allegiance to God Almighty, to serve our Temporal Interest; but by a Regular Discharge of all our Duties to God, *Cesar*, and our Neighbor, may secure both the Blessings of this and the other World; and pass thorough the mutable and imperfect state of Temporal, to the infinite and immutable Joys of Eternal Happiness. To which God of his Mercy bring us for the Merits of Jesus Christ; *To whom with the Father and blessed Spirit, be all Honour, Glory, and Adoration, both now and ever.* Amen.

---

**F I N I S.**